

JEFFERSON CLUB ELECTION BILL DEBATED BEFORE COMMITTEES.

St. Louis Democrats and Republicans Argue for and Against the Proposed New Law at Interesting Public Hearing—Efforts of Opponents of Bill Directed Mainly to Criticism of Phraseology and Laudations of the Filley Law—Mayor Wells and Harry B. Hawes Explain Why Substitute for the Nesbit Law Is Proposed.

SUMMARY OF MISSOURI ASSEMBLY.

Democrats and Republicans from St. Louis held the caucus light at the General Assembly today. The delegation of Jefferson Club Democrats arrived at a noon train and spent the afternoon with members of the Senate and House working up sentiment on the new election bill which they have submitted to take the place of the so-called Nesbit law.

A bill providing for an increase in the salaries of the Jackson County Circuit Judges was passed by the House after a spirited debate.

The Senate passed a bill making chicken stealing at night a felony. The offense is now a misdemeanor.

Senator Jewell of Kansas City introduced a bill compelling street car companies to issue transfers on transfers.

The committee substitute for the original Juvenile Court bill was reported favorably by Senator Kliney.

Representative Taylor of Pike County introduced a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicants on the World's Fair grounds.

Farris's bill permitting Recorders to keep the issuance of marriage licenses secret for three months was passed by the Senate.

BY A STAFF CORRESPONDENT.

Jefferson City, Mo., Feb. 19.—One of the most interesting public hearings of the present session of the Legislature was held in the Senate chamber to-night to hear the arguments on Senate Bill No. 235, introduced by Senator Kliney, and prepared by the Jefferson Club Committee. Nearly all of the members of the Senate and House were present. The bill is a substitute for the Nesbit law, which is a law governing the sale of intoxicants on the grounds of the World's Fair.

Summed up, the arguments of the Republicans went little farther than criticisms of phraseology and laudations of the Filley law. One speaker objected to the office force of the Election Commissioners being divided equally as far as possible. As this clause was put in simply to cover cases where a clerk might be an old man, the criticism was easily answered by the friends of the bill.

HAWES DENOUNCES CHARGES.

"The Nesbit law gave us the best Mayor we have had for a quarter of a century. Judge them by their fruits," Harry B. Hawes closed the argument by explaining the reasons for presenting the Jefferson Club bill.

"When the Nesbit law was passed in 1890," he said, "there were 132,000 names on the book. Now there are 120,000, with a big increase in population. If there had been a normal increase in population, as indicated by the Filley law registration, there would now be 145,000 names on the poll-books."

"We come here as representatives of the party in power simply to preserve the Filley name of St. Louis. We deny that St. Louis was carried by fraud. The law was not passed until an outraged citizen had arisen and turned the Republican party from power."

"We came here partly in response to the charge that the Jefferson Club was responsible for the Nesbit law. We came here chiefly to keep Republican papers from sending to Eastern papers reports that Democrats had stolen the election. The new bill should not be an outrageous abuse of the city of St. Louis. We hope to stop the infamous abuse of the city of which we are so proud."

Each side was allowed an hour and a half to present arguments. Mayor Wells, John P. Lee and Thomas K. Skinner were the first orators for the Democrats. They were followed by John A. Gilliam, Charles Nagel, Charles A. Powers, Louis P. Allen, Eugene McGuffin, John A. Gilliam, Clinton A. Welch and William J. Becker.

Mayor Wells explained the history of the bill and some of the reasons for introducing it. He was followed by Mr. Lee, one of the subcommittee of five, in an exhaustive analysis of the bill comparing its provisions with those of the law of 1890 and 1895. He said the bill was introduced for the reasons for the different provisions and their effect being clearly explained.

Mr. Skinner made a few preliminary precautions which were taken to guard against fraudulent registration, especially the provisions relating to the publicity of all lists.

GILLIAM PRAISES THE BILL.

Mr. Gilliam, president of the Merchants' League Club, made the first Republican speech against the measure. He reviewed the old Filley law and suggested amendments to Senate bill No. 235. He paid many compliments to the bill, but insisted that to the sincerity of the men who had framed the measure.

"Every one of them whom I know could be trusted with my purse or reputation," he said. "They have tried honestly to name a good law, and I think they have looked only a few points."

Charles A. Powers, Republican City Commissioner, presented amendments to the Jefferson Club bill, most of them being of a minor nature.

Charles Nagel congratulated the Jefferson Club committee on the improvements in their bill over the Filley law, but insisted that there were flaws.

Eugene McGuffin and Louis P. Allen both mentioned phraseology and spoke of possibilities of fraud.

George J. Tausky of the Jefferson Club committee answered the arguments of the Republicans. He asked the Assembly to judge the Filley and the Nesbit laws by their fruits. Most of the criticisms were characterized as captious. Harry Hawes closed the debate.

SENATOR-ELECT STONE PRESENT.

Senator-elect William J. Stone was one of the attendees at the hearing. Included in the St. Louis delegations of Democrats were Mayor Wells, Harry B. Hawes, John P. Lee, George J. Tausky, Thomas P. Criss, Thomas K. Skinner, Charles Skinner, John A. Wood, T. J. Ward, James J. Player, Charles W. Bates, William J. Fyfe, George Combs, Frank M. Kleber, John R. Butler, John J. Burke and John P. Dolan.

Among the Republicans present were Charles Nagel, George C. Hitchcock, William H. Hahn, Charles A. Powers, Louis P. Allen, Eugene McGuffin, John A. Gilliam, Clinton A. Welch and William J. Becker.

ST. LOUIS MEMBERS SURPRISED.

Bill introduced to prohibit sale of liquor at World's Fair.

Jefferson City, Mo., Feb. 19.—Mr. Taylor of Pike County surprised to-day by introducing a bill in the House to prohibit the sale of intoxicants on the grounds of the World's Fair during the Exposition.

The bill contains five sections. The first is engaged in conducting an Exposition or World's Fair, where women and children are allowed to enter, from selling, exposing for sale or giving away any intoxicating liquors, including whiskey, wine, gin, beer or ale or any other malt or vinous liquors, on the grounds or within any building of said World's Fair.

Section 2 prohibits the granting to any person the right to enter the World's Fair grounds for the purpose of selling or giving away intoxicating liquors.

Section 3 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 4 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 5 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 6 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 7 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 8 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 9 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 10 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 11 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 12 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 13 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 14 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 15 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

Section 16 provides for the forfeiture of the charter granted by the State to the World's Fair if the first two sections of the bill are violated.

FACTORY INSPECTION FOR BIG CITIES ONLY

House Engrosses Senate Bill Restricting the Operation of the Present Law.

Measure Introduced in the House Would Require Inspection Throughout State and Do Away With Fees.

REPUBLIC SPECIAL.

Jefferson City, Mo., Feb. 19.—After a debate of two hours, the House to-day engrossed a Senate bill limiting the operation of the factory inspection law to St. Louis, Kansas City, St. Joseph and Joplin.

The matter came up on a majority and minority report from a special committee having under consideration the Senate bill and a House bill, the latter abolishing the fee system of inspection.

The Senate bill merely amends the present law by confining the operation of factory inspection to cities of 30,000 inhabitants and over. This takes in St. Louis, Kansas City, St. Joseph and Joplin. The Senate bill does not disturb the fee system.

The House bill, introduced by Mr. Duncan of St. Joseph, abolished the fee system and applied factory inspection to all parts of the State, as is provided in the present law, and provided for dividing the State into districts and at least two inspections annually.

Mr. Haines of Saline favored the Senate bill. He said he was willing for the large cities of the State to have factory inspection, but the rest of the State does not need it. For this reason, he hoped, the Senate bill would be adopted.

Mr. Parkinson of St. Joseph said the enactment of the Senate bill would be equivalent to a repeal of the present law. It would change legislation and in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. Murphy of St. Louis favored the House bill. He said in a short speech, which he emphasized with a second and third speech later on.

TOLD COLDEN TO SIT DOWN.

Mr. Colden of Nodaway, in attacking the House bill, drifted off into an attack on the large cities. He said they were always the cause of trouble. He said he would like to see the remainder of the State would have to contribute, as in the case of the House bill, to the expense of the inspection.

"Do you know how much taxes St. Louis pays?" asked Mr. Selph of St. Louis.

"Then why don't you take your seat?" Mr. Selph said.

"St. Louis pays 70 per cent on the actual valuation of all property," said Mr. Selph. "The large cities pay 40 per cent. The large cities pay more than 70 per cent of all State taxes."

Mr. Selph said that the country grass was growing in the streets of St. Louis.

Duncan made a strong speech in behalf of his bill. With strong words he pressed great alarm for the welfare of the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

FACTORY INSPECTION FOR BIG CITIES ONLY

House Engrosses Senate Bill Restricting the Operation of the Present Law.

Measure Introduced in the House Would Require Inspection Throughout State and Do Away With Fees.

REPUBLIC SPECIAL.

Jefferson City, Mo., Feb. 19.—After a debate of two hours, the House to-day engrossed a Senate bill limiting the operation of the factory inspection law to St. Louis, Kansas City, St. Joseph and Joplin.

The matter came up on a majority and minority report from a special committee having under consideration the Senate bill and a House bill, the latter abolishing the fee system of inspection.

The Senate bill merely amends the present law by confining the operation of factory inspection to cities of 30,000 inhabitants and over. This takes in St. Louis, Kansas City, St. Joseph and Joplin. The Senate bill does not disturb the fee system.

The House bill, introduced by Mr. Duncan of St. Joseph, abolished the fee system and applied factory inspection to all parts of the State, as is provided in the present law, and provided for dividing the State into districts and at least two inspections annually.

Mr. Haines of Saline favored the Senate bill. He said he was willing for the large cities of the State to have factory inspection, but the rest of the State does not need it. For this reason, he hoped, the Senate bill would be adopted.

Mr. Parkinson of St. Joseph said the enactment of the Senate bill would be equivalent to a repeal of the present law. It would change legislation and in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. Murphy of St. Louis favored the House bill. He said in a short speech, which he emphasized with a second and third speech later on.

TOLD COLDEN TO SIT DOWN.

Mr. Colden of Nodaway, in attacking the House bill, drifted off into an attack on the large cities. He said they were always the cause of trouble. He said he would like to see the remainder of the State would have to contribute, as in the case of the House bill, to the expense of the inspection.

"Do you know how much taxes St. Louis pays?" asked Mr. Selph of St. Louis.

"Then why don't you take your seat?" Mr. Selph said.

"St. Louis pays 70 per cent on the actual valuation of all property," said Mr. Selph. "The large cities pay 40 per cent. The large cities pay more than 70 per cent of all State taxes."

Mr. Selph said that the country grass was growing in the streets of St. Louis.

Duncan made a strong speech in behalf of his bill. With strong words he pressed great alarm for the welfare of the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

He concluded with an argument showing that the bill would be a benefit to the State. He said he would carry the bill to the House.

COTTON ALMOST AT TEN-CENT MARK.

Advance of a Dollar a Bale Was Attended by Excited Scenes at New York Exchange.

Speculation As to a Corner.

REPUBLIC SPECIAL.

New York, Feb. 19.—There was a further advance in the price of cotton to-day, which carried prices up to the record figures. Cotton is now selling on practically a 10-cent basis for immediate deliveries, and the entire trade is wondering whether the movement will force the prices of options for near-by months up to that figure.

The top-notch figures for cotton reached to-day were 9.80 cents a pound for February, 9.85 for March and May and 9.90 for July. The closing figures were the best of the day.

As a rule when cotton touches 10 cents a pound every one in the trade repeats the old saying, "Cotton is king," but such was not the case to-day. Practically the entire Cotton Exchange was figuring whether a corner had not developed in the cotton market, and those who vigorously opposed the recent upward movement were loud in their denunciations of the boldness of the pools conducting the bull campaign in cotton.

Less than two weeks ago the bears ridiculed the statement that spot cotton would reach 10 cents a pound and customers were advised to take profits and get out of the market.

Since that time cotton has advanced nearly 50 cents.

Disappointed bears did not lose heart during the advance, but became more confident as the price moved upward. To-night the cotton trade closed its business in a more mystified condition as to the future of the market than has been the case in many years.

EXCITEMENT IN AFTERNOON.

The trading in the morning did not indicate that there were any surprises in store, for there was a dull and heavy tendency.

In the afternoon, however, the market developed marvelous strength and prices began to climb. There were the usual exciting scenes on the floor of the exchange, and before the close the pit was in a ferment of excitement.

Frightened shorts began to cover, but there was little cotton for sale, and this, coupled with aggressive buying by the pools, sent quotations up to the highest of the season.

</